

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-24 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-24 have been rejected. Claims 1, 3, 4, 10-13, 15, 16, 22 and 24 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled as part of the foregoing amendments. Therefore, claims 1-24 remain pending in the present application.

Claim 3 is objected to because “the limitation ‘protecting (KD(copy)) to a rights management (RM) server’ appears to be a typographical error” (Office Action dated February 27, 2007 (“Office Action”) at § 2, p. 2). The above limitation also appears in claim 15. Applicants respectfully submit that the above limitation does not contain a typographical error. Nonetheless, Applicants have amended claims 3 and 15 to further clarify the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully request, therefore, that the objection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-14 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as their invention. With respect to claims 1-14, the Office Action contends that it is unclear whether the limitation “whereby the rights data can be discovered” is part of the claimed invention (Office Action at § 3, p. 2). Furthermore, with respect to claims 10 and 22, the Office Action contends that the limitation “substantially all” is a relative term that renders the claims indefinite. Although Applicants believe that the present claims are not indefinite, Applicants have amended claims 1, 10, 13 and 22 in an effort to facilitate prosecution. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2, be withdrawn.

Claims 1-2, 6-14 and 18-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0077985 (“Kobata”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,714,921 (“Stefik”).

In particular, the Office Action contends that Stefik teaches defining rights data for a copy of a document based on the rights information of a folder (*see* Office Action at § 6, p. 4). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Independent claims 1 and 13 recite, in part, a folder having rights information associated therewith. Rights data for a copy of a document in the folder are defined based on the rights information of the folder.

As noted in the present specification, a folder may have access controls, such as read-only, read-write, all rights, *etc.* (*Specification* at ¶ [0138]). Upon receiving a request for a copy of a document stored in the folder, a document store may map the access controls into RM rights (*id.* at ¶¶ [0143] and [0144]). For example, a folder having only read-only access would translate to view-only RM protection rights (*id.* at ¶ [0139]). The RM rights may then be defined in the rights data of the copy of the requested document (*id.* at ¶ [0144]). The rights data may be in a custom data portion of the copy of the document (*id.* at ¶ [0125]).

In another embodiment, the folder may have a specific rights template (*id.* at ¶ [0139]). The specific rights template may define particular rights (*id.* at ¶ [0139]). For example, the rights template may define a set of rights for all word processing documents stored in the folder (*id.* at ¶ [0139]). Upon receiving the request for the copy of the document, the document store may copy at least a portion of the rights template into the RM rights defined in the rights data of the copy of the requested document (*id.* at ¶ [0145]).

Thus, the RM rights defined in the rights data of the copy of the requested document are based on a predetermined set of rights associated with the folder in which the document is stored.

By contrast, Stefik teaches that digital works stored in a folder are subject to their own rights. More specifically, the portions of Stefik cited in the Office Action disclose that usage rights and file management rights can be attached to a folder (Stefik at col. 11, ll. 2-3). Stefik further discloses that the digital works in the folder “*are subject to their own rights*” (*id.* at col. 11, ll. 5-6) (emphasis added). That is, the rights of the digital works stored in the folder are independent of the rights attached to the folder itself. Consequently, Stefik notes that the rights of the digital works may differ from, and therefore conflict with, the rights of the folder (*id.* at col. 11, ll. 35-40).

Thus, Stefik does not disclose, teach, or suggest defining rights data for a copy of a document in a folder based on the rights information of the folder, as recited in the present claims.

As acknowledged in the Office Action, Kobata does not teach defining rights data for a copy of a document in a folder based on the rights information of the folder (*see* Office Action at § 6, p. 4).

**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-2185/302760.2  
**Application No.:** 10/632,356  
**Office Action Dated:** February 27, 2007

**PATENT**

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 13 patentably define over the cited references. As claims 2 and 6-12 depend from claim 1, and claims 14 and 18-24 depend from claim 13, Applicants further submit that the dependent claims are likewise allowable. Applicants respectfully request, therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-2, 6-14 and 18-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kobata in view of Stefik.

Claims 3-5 and 15-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobata in view of Stefik and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,571,337 (“Xiao”). As claims 3-5 depend from claim 1, and claims 15-17 depend from claim 13, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this rejection for at least the same reasons discussed above.

**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-2185/302760.2  
**Application No.:** 10/632,356  
**Office Action Dated:** February 27, 2007

**PATENT**

### **CONCLUSION**

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are allowable and that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. In the event that the Examiner cannot allow the present application for any reason, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney, Bryan T. Giles at (215) 564-8954, to discuss the resolution of any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 29, 2007

/Bryan T. Giles/  
Bryan T. Giles  
Registration No. 60,078

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439